

### REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18-22 have been rejected. Claims 5 and 17 have been objected to; however, Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claims 5 and 17 have been rewritten in this Response to overcome Examiner's objection. Claims 1-4 and 11-16 have been cancelled in this Response.

### **Specification**

The specification is objected to because the Abstract exceeds 150 words. An amended Abstract is submitted herewith to overcome this objection.

### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 6-10 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, Examiner has noted that "each of claims 6-9, 18-21 recites 'said transaction comprises'" which lacks antecedent basis. The limitations of independent claims 1 and 11 have been incorporated into dependent claims 5 and 17, respectively, as discussed herein. The limitations of these independent claims incorporated into dependent claims 5 and 17 have been amended to substitute "a transaction" in place the plural term "transactions" previously recited in these independent claims. Applicants submit, therefore, that the term "said transaction" in claims 6-10 and 18-22 is now supported by antecedent basis. Claim 22 has been amended to recite that information is "stored" in the HT configuration space shadow register. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 6-10 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112 have been overcome.

Claims 1-3 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c), as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0043836 to Rashid et al. (hereinafter "Rashid"). Claims 4, 6-9, 18, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Rashid. Claims 1-4 and 11-16 have been canceled in this Response. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the rejection of those claims is now moot. Dependent claims 6-9 and 18-21 have been amended to depend from claims 5 and 17, respectively. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable since they are dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the USPTO on April 17, 2006.</p> <p><i>Gary W Hamilton</i></p> <p>_____ Attorney for Applicant(s)</p>
--

Respectfully submitted,

*Gary W Hamilton*  
Gary W. Hamilton  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 31,834